



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A NOTE IN REFERENCE TO THE "MASSORA AMONG THE SYRIANS."

BY PROFESSOR ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.,
Metropolitan Museum, New York City.

On page 22 of *HEBRAICA* for October, 1885, in Dr. Warfield's translation of the Abbé Martin's section on the Massora among the Syrians, the spelling of *Ebediesu* is given once as "Aud-Icho;" and a few lines below the spelling "Audicho" is given as representing that which "the Nestorians call" the name of "Ebed-Jesu." To those not familiar with the subject, it might seem that the Nestorians had a different orthography; which is not the case. The Nestorians spell the name in the same way as the other Syrians (vocalizing the *waw*, however as *o*); and the "Au," supposing it to be a tolerable French representation, is merely a matter of pronunciation, chiefly of the *be th*, for which the reasons and procedure may be read in Stoddard and Nöldecke. As to the "ch," that is apparently the French method of expressing our "sh;" for the consonant is *shin*.* As the 'ee or 'äin in both words is unnoticed in the spelling, neither is an adequate representation of the Syrian pronunciation; but that alone would call for no remark.

Is it out of order to protest against the representation, in this generation, of *šade* by "ts," as in "Bar-Tsalibi," on page 23 of the same article? To say nothing of the general facts on the subject, and the special fact that "ts" is the perpetuation of a former European misapprehension, which the Europeans themselves are now dropping, it is not possible that Bar Šalibi himself or his contemporaries could have so pronounced the name—any more than the modern Arabic- or Syriac-speaking peoples do, among whom the name Šalibi is still common. We are gradually outgrowing some of the early mistakes about Oriental consonants—among which was the representation of 'äin by *ng*, a sound so difficult for the Orientals that they commonly reproduce it in speech as either *n* or *nk*. It is hard to get at the facts in such matters from books alone, even from such an admirable statement of them as is to be found in Wright's *Arabic Grammar*; but it is worth while to try to keep on outgrowing mistakes.

Dr. Warfield deserves the thanks of the readers of *HEBRAICA* for his translation. It is but fair to say, however, that, as is implied in Dr. Warfield's footnote on page 13, this article of the Abbé Martin's by no means exhausts the subject, nor, so far as I am aware, presents any thing more than a short sketch of

* The author's mode of transliteration differs slightly from that which is generally followed in this Journal.

facts and inferences more fully presented elsewhere. Also, that the Abbé Martin's general conclusion presented itself as a possibility to Wiseman about sixty years ago, as to others since. My own conclusion, from going over the ground pretty well; a few years ago, was that the balance of argument favored the existence, past if not present, of a Karkaphensian *version* of at least a portion of the Scriptures, and that, so far as could be ascertained or conjectured, it was based on the Peshitto. A partial hint of the reasons is all that can be given here. The fact is suppressed by Martin that the same MS. which contains the **ܐܡܪ ܡܠܟܡܢܬܐ ܕܥܡܝܐ**—which Rosen and Forshall (not Forschall) translated by "*secundum VERSIONEM Karkaphensem!*" (I take the *italics*, etc., from *HEBRAICA*, for Rosen and Forshall do not have them, of course)—mentions also several times the Peshitto version and the Harklensian version, both of which it calls by the name of **ܡܠܟܡܢܬܐ ܕܥܡܝܐ**, in the sense of *version*. The same phenomenon occurs in other manuscripts. At the same time, the manuscript (it is 7183 Rich, British Museum) gives other Massoretic matters besides those taken from the Karkaphensian, Peshitto, and Harklensian "*versions*," taking them from a series of authors and treatises; but it calls none of these latter sources by the above name of **ܡܠܟܡܢܬܐ ܕܥܡܝܐ**. Moreover, Rosen and Forshall expressly state in a foot-note, at their rendering "*versionem*," that "*Eodem voce Jacobus Edessenus versiones Simplicem et Heracleensem designat, fol. 99. b;*" showing that they had considered the matter. The statement of their foot-note, however, needs a little explanation: instead of *James of Edessa* designating the Peshitto and Harklensian by the same word, it is *this MS.* that does so, at the place which they correctly cite, viz., fol. 99. b.; and the whole MS. is ascribed by its title to James of Edessa, though it—original composition, as well as this copy—is probably much later than his time. Rosen and Forshall might doubtless have cited Gregory Bar Ebraeus for the same use of the term; but their quotations from the latter's "*Treasure of Mysteries*" only show that he put the Peshitto, the Harklensian, and the Karkaphensian on the same footing as Scripture, by a common designation, as if all were *versions*; while other sources that were not versions have a different designation. Rosen and Forshall might have further fortified their rendering by citing the title to the Hexaplar, where the same word is used of the Septuagint *version*. So Assemâni, Wiseman, Rosen and Forshall, and others, have a pretty sound basis to stand upon, which the Abbé Martin does not (at least in the matter translated by Dr. Warfield) care to show to his more popular readers, although he is well aware of its existence. In this light his capitals and exclamation point do not quite suit Saxon frankness. A study of the use of **ܡܠܟܡܢܬܐ ܕܥܡܝܐ** in Syriac literature would still further diminish the scarecrow force of his exclamation point and capitals; but into this we need not go—at least no further than to remark that the "*tradition*" in the word means rather "*delivered*" than "*handed down*," or than "*received from old time*." In that sense it is much

like *παράδοσις* and *παράδοσις*; and in several places where, from our English version or the Greek, we might expect to find it, it is replaced in the Peshitto New Testament by ܬܠܡܝܬܐ, *teaching, doctrine, (teacher's) commandment*. As applied to a version, the etymology might make us suppose that the medial step was to indicate *the translation delivered by*—e. g., the Seventy; but etymological reminders do not outweigh usage in the definition or understanding of a word.

Just two things more may be mentioned. One is that, if the quotation from Assemâni had included two more of his lines, it would appear that the above triple assemblage of versions, or whatever the common designation of them means, were reckoned as occupying a higher plane than the Nestorian copies of the Scriptures. These lines read: “*Demum singulis fere paginis notantur variæ lectiones, seu punctationes Nestorianorum, hoc est, Chaldæorum, qui Nestorii labe infecti sunt.*” The other thing is, that it is hard to explain *all* the statements and Scripture extracts in Wiseman, under the general Karkaphensian subject, as belonging merely to the Syriac Massora, to a *correctorium* whose scope was larger, or even to an exegetical work. I may say, also, to show that a short extract may *seem* to be from an exegetical work, and yet be part of a double version, that Syriac MSS. exist (one of the sort is in my hands just now) in which *two versions* of an entire composition occupy the same pages; a sentence of one version following a sentence of the other, all through—much after the fashion of an interlinear translation, only it is not interlinear, but in interrupting portions.

Had we only these Syriac Massora MSS., and not the actual Peshitto and Harklensian too (and perhaps we may include the Septuagint also), the Abbé Martin's arguments would inevitably sweep them out of existence along with the Karkaphensian. His statement that all the mountains of Europe and Asia have been ransacked, and every crack and cranny searched, is hyperbolic, and not enough to show that no fragment of a Karkaphensian may yet turn up. The European libraries alone have not yet told all their secrets to the ransackers. It is better to study the Syrian Massora, and reap its benefits, holding in suspense the question of the existence of a Karkaphensian version, than to throw away the stimulus which the balance of argument seems now to furnish in the line of possible discovery. Unless, indeed, we may see another alternative, in the Abbé's conclusions, and begin a general ransacking for MSS. which present hitherto unknown Massoras, but which must exist somewhere as the Peshitto, Harklensian, Septuagint, and other “traditions.”